

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

TINA L. MILAM,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	
SOUTHAVEN POLICE DEPARTMENT;)	
DETECTIVE TODD SAMPLES, in his)	
Official capacity; BAPTIST)	
MEMORIAL HOSPITAL DESOTO;)	
JERRY POPE, in his Capacity as)	
Administrator of BMH; JANE DOE, in her)	
capacity as Charge Nurse at BMH; JOHN)	
DOE, in his official capacity as)	
Supervisor of Security at BMH;)	
MLGW PENSION DEPARTMENT;)	
MLGW INSURANCE DEPARTMENT;)	No. 15-cv-02029-SHL-dkv
MLGW RESIDENTIAL DEPARTMENT;)	
MARCUS TATE, in his capacity)	
as employee of MLGW; TODD)	
WILLIAMS, in his capacity)	
as attorney for MLGW; IVAN NORMAN, in)	
her capacity as employee of MLGW; LG&W)	
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION; ATT)	
CORPORATE OFFICE HEADQUARTERS;)	
ATT FRAUD DEPARTMENT; BARRY C.)	
BLACKBURN, Attorney; EUGENIA J.)	
JACKSON, Notary Public; WILL TATE;)	
RONNIE SMITH, SR.; INELL)	
KNOWLTON; ELLA MAE MCGINISTER;)	
and AUDREY KNOWLTON,)	
Defendants.)	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING CASE**

Before the Court is the Magistrate Judge's "Report and Recommendation for *Sua Sponte* Dismissal" (the "Report and Recommendation"), which was filed on February 13, 2015. (ECF

No. 7.) Plaintiff filed a timely objection to the Report and Recommendation on March 10, 2015.
(See ECF No. 10.)

District courts must conduct a *de novo* review of the parts of a magistrate judge's report and recommendation to which a party objects. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, after conducting a *de novo review*, a district court is not required to articulate all of the reasons it rejects a party's objections. Tuggle v. Seabold, 806 F.2d 87, 92 (6th Cir. 1986). This Court has conducted a *de novo* review by reviewing the record before the Magistrate Judge in light of Plaintiff's objections and hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in its entirety. The Magistrate Judge correctly held that this Court has no jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims because there is neither a federal question nor complete diversity between the parties.

Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation are filled with inaccurate statements of fact, *e.g.*, claiming the Magistrate Judge relied on an overruled case when that case was not cited or referred to in the Report and Recommendation, and citations to cases that are clearly irrelevant to the issues at hand. Plaintiff's primary claim is that the Magistrate Judge erred by dismissing her case without giving her an opportunity to amend her complaint. Plaintiff repeatedly argues that all of her claims can be cured through an amendment to her complaint, but she fails to point to any additional factual or legal allegations that would remedy the jurisdictional issues Magistrate Judge Vescovo noted in the Report and Recommendation. Upon *de novo* review, the Court finds that Plaintiff has failed to plausibly plead claims over which Court has jurisdiction and that any amendment to her complaint would be futile. Plaintiff's complaint is accordingly DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 10th day of April, 2015.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
